

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in view of the above-referenced Office Action, and reconsideration is requested in view of the following remarks. The examiner's continued diligence and efforts in this application are greatly appreciated.

Claim Objections

Applicant has amended claims 23-24 and 33 to overcome the claim objections noted on pages 3-4 of the latest office action. The amendments to these claims are directed to formal matters and do not go to the substantive meaning or scope of protection afforded by the claims.

Regarding the Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-14, 16-19, 21-22 and 24-38 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Demartines et al. (US Patent 6,661,409), hereinafter the '409 reference, in view of Tan et al. (US Patent 5,917,493), hereinafter the '493 reference. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Demartines et al. (US Patent 6,661,409), hereinafter the '409 reference, in view of Tan et al. (US Patent 5,917,493), hereinafter the '493 reference, and further in view of Haneda et al. (US Patent 5,698,822), hereinafter the '822 reference. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Demartines et al. (US Patent 6,661,409), hereinafter the '409 reference, in view of Tan et al. (US Patent 5,917,493), hereinafter the '493 reference, and further in view of Kuriyama et al. (US Patent 5,838,302), hereinafter the '302 reference. Applicant respectfully traverses these bases of rejection of the pending claims.

Applicant submits that it might be helpful to first review the language of the claims, in which the recitations of the claims, taking claim 1 for instance, set forth two displays if you will: a touch input screen and a display element, which are different elements of the electronic device. The touch input screen accepts written input. The display element differs from the touch input screen in that it is operable to display two types of information, both derived from the written input, in two different modes. In a text recognition mode, the display element displays recognized text determined from the written input using a recognition feature coupled to the touch input screen.

In an ink only mode, the display element displays digital ink that corresponds to the written input provided to the touch input screen and that may be edited by the user.

As has been previously discussed, the ‘409 reference has an input area 104 and a display area 105 but fails to anticipate the recitations of the instant claims because it has no teaching that input may be entered in input area 104 and then displayed, directly or otherwise, in a display area 105 as digital ink correcting to the entered input. ‘409 teaches that only after input data has been processed through a recognition element to generate text may it be displayed in display area 105; so-called digital ink is never displayed in display area 105. The ‘493 reference is used by the examiner in an attempt to overcome this failing of the ‘409 reference. In particular, the examiner states that the ‘409 reference fails to teach “displaying the written input provided to the touch input screen in an ink only mode, nor where the digital ink may be edited by the user.” and relies upon the ‘493 reference to teach these recitations of the claimed invention.

The ‘493 reference, however, does not teach or disclose the recitations lacking in the ‘409 reference. There is no teaching or suggestion of a display element, separate from a touch input screen, operable to display either digital ink or recognized text, depending upon a mode of an electronic device.

Consider first that the ‘493 reference does not cure the defect of the ‘409 reference (of not teaching displaying digital ink in a display area separate from a touch input screen) because it does not itself teach, disclose or suggest this claim element. It also fails to teach, suggest or disclose displaying in a display area separate from a touch input screen recognized text that is generated by processing written input through a recognition element; indeed, ‘493 never shows or teaches displaying recognized text on any display element or input screen at all (see below). Rather, *the only thing that is displayed is the written input directly entered by a user on touch screen 109 of display 108* (shown in figure 3). This is the only feature that could be construed as a display element in the reference but it is not a display area separate from where written input is received (but the same area). Again, the touch screen 109, being the only display feature of the ‘493 reference (please reference screen 109 of display 108; see figures 1A, 1B, 1C, 2 and 3),

cannot constitute a separate display element, as recited in the claims. Thus, combining the ‘409 and ‘493 references together does not yield this recitation of the instant claims.

Because the ‘493 reference does not teach a display element separate from its touch input screen and only teaches a touch input screen, Applicant cannot understand the motivation to combine this reference with the ‘409 reference in an effort to show display of digital ink in an area separate from the touch input screen area into which written input is received.

Furthermore, the ‘493 reference does not in fact display digital ink that corresponds to the written input in an area separate from the data input area. Instead, the ‘493 reference specifically states that information may be entered in only one of two ways: via the keypad 102 or stylus 104 in touch screen 109. Of course, it is recognized that entry of data via the keypad is not digital ink within the meaning of Applicant’s claims. The reference further teaches that use of the stylus for entry of data occurs in a hand writing recognition mode in which the stylus is able to render a “pen” drawing of the image directly on screen 109. Column 4, lines 38-46. What is displayed on touch screen 109 is the direct, unprocessed data entered by the user. Initialization as taught by ‘493 causes the apparatus to initialize and designate a handwriting recognition mode of operation (column 5, lines 49-56), and “Initialization has by default put the stylus 104 in the handwriting recognition mode, DRAW INK.” (column 6, lines 61-63). The ‘493 reference accordingly teaches that all stylus mode functions, whether they be WRITE TEXT, DRAW INK, ERASE INK, SELECT INK, occur in a handwriting recognition mode. Consider for example the following teachings of ‘493 on this point:

- All stylus 104 functions occur in a handwriting recognition mode (column 4, lines 38-46) and include WRITE TEXT, DRAW INK, ERASE INK, SELECT INK. Column 5, lines 28-32
- The various stylus modes of functions are accessed via mode virtual key 307. Column 5, lines 35-37; column 6, lines 66-67; column 7, lines 3-6.
- The WRITE mode is a handwriting recognition mode. Column 5, lines 39-41
- DRAW INK is a handwriting recognition mode. Column 6, lines 63-64
- DRAW INK, SELECT INK are graphics modes. Column 7, lines 1-4

- SELECT INK is a “momentary graphics mode” operation that allows a boundary to be drawn around some INK and then an editing operation to be performed on the selected INK. Column 5, lines 28-33, column 7, lines 2-4

It is clear from the foregoing that the ‘493 reference does not in fact display digital ink that corresponds to the written input and instead requires that the written input provided to the computer of the ‘493 reference by means of a stylus is processed in a handwriting recognition mode and is in this way similar to 409 reference. As will be explained, this handwriting recognition mode generates information stored as pages by the computer of the ‘493 reference that may later be retrieved and manipulated, as will be described.

It may be helpful to consider what the ‘493 reference actually teaches with regard to its handwriting recognition mode. As previously stated, whenever stylus operation is triggered, as upon initialization of the device or upon use of the stylus, the data entered via the stylus is processed in the handwriting recognition mode. As explained at column 6, line 59, to column 7, line 17, in which treatment of a hand drawn map requires processing of the written input from the stylus in handwriting recognition and graphics (drawing) modes. The handwritten text is recognized in the handwriting recognition mode not for purpose of display to another display area (which it does not have) but to provide for saving the data entered as pages that may be captured to form individual data sets that may at a later time be organized or otherwise manipulated post-creation, such as “stuck” into another application. Since the written input is to be manipulated in this way, the ‘493 reference processes written input with hand writing recognition technology to assist this manipulation of information arranged in paginal files. Please reference the Abstract, the Summary and column 7, line 17-column 10, line 31, of the ‘493 reference.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant must respectfully submit that combination of the ‘409 and ‘493 references fails to render the pending claims unpatentable. The combination does not yield a result that teaches, discloses or suggests a display element separate from a touch input screen or displaying digital ink corresponding to written input in an ink only mode (‘493 does not have an ink only mode, instead all stylus operations occur in a handwriting recognition mode which results may be stored but are not displayed on screen 109), or different treatment of written input

as a function of what mode (ink only or text recognition mode). It is noted that independent claims 1, 4, and 19 all reference the distinct display areas and modes of operation in the claim language and thus all are patentably distinct over the cited art.

Further, with regard to claims 15 and 23, applicant notes that these claims depend from independent claims 4 and 19, respectively, which are believed to be patentably distinct for the various reasons discussed above.

Concluding Remarks

In light of the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remaining claims define patentable subject matter over the art of record.

The undersigned additionally notes that other distinctions may exist between the cited art and the claims, and reiterates the distinctions previously discussed in the prior response. In view of the clear distinctions pointed out above, further discussion is believed to be unnecessary at this time. Failure to explicitly address each point raised in the Office Action should accordingly not be viewed as accession to the Examiner's position or an admission of any sort.

In view of this communication, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance and such is respectfully requested at an early date. If further matters remain to be resolved, the undersigned respectfully requests the courtesy of an interview and may be reached at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
/Renee' Michelle Leveque/
Renee' Michelle Leveque
Registration No. 36,193
Leveque Intellectual Property Law, P.C.
221 East Church Street
Frederick, MD 21701
301-668-3073